

answered "present" 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—356

Abercrombie	Doolittle	LaFalce
Ackerman	Doyle	LaHood
Allen	Dreier	Lampson
Andrews	Duncan	Lantos
Archer	Dunn	Largent
Armey	Edwards	Larson
Baca	Ehlers	Latham
Bachus	Ehrlich	Lazio
Baker	Emerson	Leach
Baldacci	Engel	Lee
Baldwin	Eshoo	Levin
Ballenger	Etheridge	Lewis (CA)
Barcia	Evans	Lewis (KY)
Barr	Ewing	Linder
Barrett (WI)	Farr	Lipinski
Bartlett	Fattah	Lofgren
Barton	Fletcher	Lowe
Bass	Foley	Lucas (KY)
Becerra	Forbes	Lucas (OK)
Bentsen	Ford	Luther
Bereuter	Fossella	Maloney (CT)
Berkley	Fowler	Maloney (NY)
Berman	Frank (MA)	Manzullo
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Martinez
Biggert	Frost	Mascara
Bilirakis	Gallely	Matsui
Bishop	Ganske	McCarthy (MO)
Blagojevich	Gedenson	McCarthy (NY)
Bliley	Gephardt	McCollum
Blumenauer	Gilchrest	McGovern
Blunt	Gillmor	McHugh
Boehlert	Gilman	McInnis
Boehner	Gonzalez	McIntosh
Bonilla	Goode	McIntyre
Bono	Goodlatte	McKeon
Boswell	Goodling	McKinney
Boucher	Gordon	McNulty
Boyd	Goss	Meehan
Brady (TX)	Graham	Meek (FL)
Bryant	Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Burr	Green (WI)	Menendez
Burton	Greenwood	Metcalfe
Buyer	Hall (OH)	Mica
Callahan	Hall (TX)	Millender-
Calvert	Hansen	McDonald
Camp	Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Canady	Hayes	Miller, George
Cannon	Hayworth	Minge
Capps	Herger	Mink
Capuano	Hill (IN)	Moakley
Cardin	Hinchey	Mollohan
Carson	Hinojosa	Moore
Castle	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Chabot	Hoeffel	Morella
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Murtha
Clayton	Holden	Myrick
Clement	Holt	Nadler
Clyburn	Hooley	Napolitano
Coble	Horn	Neal
Collins	Hostettler	Nethercutt
Combest	Houghton	Ney
Condit	Hoyer	Northup
Conyers	Hunter	Nussle
Cook	Hutchinson	Obey
Cooksey	Inslee	Olver
Cox	Isakson	Ortiz
Coyne	Istook	Ose
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Oxley
Cummings	(TX)	Packard
Cunningham	Jenkins	Pascarell
Danner	John	Pastor
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Paul
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E.B.	Payne
Davis (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Pease
Deal	Jones (NC)	Pelosi
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Petri
DeLauro	Kaptur	Phelps
DeLay	Kelly	Pickering
DeMint	Kennedy	Pitts
Deutsch	Kildee	Pombo
Diaz-Balart	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
Dickey	Kind (WI)	Porter
Dicks	King (NY)	Portman
Dingell	Kleczka	Price (NC)
Dixon	Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)
Doggett	Kolbe	Radanovich
Dooley	Kuykendall	Rahall

Regula	Shimkus	Tierney
Reyes	Shows	Toomey
Reynolds	Shuster	Towns
Rivers	Simpson	Trafigant
Rodriguez	Sisisky	Turner
Roemer	Skeen	Udall (CO)
Rogers	Skelton	Upton
Rohrabacher	Smith (MI)	Velazquez
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Vento
Rothman	Smith (TX)	Walden
Roukema	Smith (WA)	Walsh
Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Wamp
Royce	Souder	Watkins
Rush	Spratt	Watt (NC)
Ryan (WI)	Stabenow	Watts (OK)
Ryun (KS)	Stearns	Waxman
Sanchez	Stenholm	Weiner
Sanford	Stump	Weldon (FL)
Sawyer	Sununu	Weldon (PA)
Saxton	Talent	Wexler
Scarborough	Tanner	Weygand
Schakowsky	Tauscher	Whitfield
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Wicker
Serrano	Taylor (NC)	Wilson
Sessions	Terry	Wolf
Shadegg	Thomas	Woolsey
Shaw	Thornberry	Wynn
Shays	Thune	Young (FL)
Sherman	Thurman	
Sherwood	Tiahrt	

NAYS—47

Aderholt	Hefley	Sabo
Baird	Hill (MT)	Sandin
Bilbray	Hilleary	Schaffer
Bonior	Hilliard	Stark
Borski	Kingston	Strickland
Brady (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Stupak
Brown (OH)	LoBiondo	Sweeney
Chenoweth-Hage	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Costello	Moran (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Crowley	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Pallone	Udall (NM)
English	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Filner	Pickett	Waters
Gibbons	Ramstad	Weller
Gutierrez	Riley	Wu
Gutknecht	Rogan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—30

Barrett (NE)	Hulshof	Quinn
Bateman	Hyde	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Salmon
Clay	Kasich	Sanders
Coburn	Klink	Scott
Crane	Kucinich	Slaughter
Everett	LaTourette	Spence
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Vitter
Gekas	McDermott	Wise
Granger	Norwood	Young (AK)

□ 1052

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 2418, ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, Members will want to know that this afternoon a Dear Colleague letter will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of April 3 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 2418, the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments of 1999.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 12 noon on Monday, April 3, to

the Committee on Rules in room H-312 in the Capitol. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Commerce.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to assure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3908, 2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 450 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 450

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 58, lines 9 through 17. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment printed in part A of the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report. The amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for

electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend and colleague, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate on this issue only.

Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on Rules parlance, we describe H.Res. 450 as an open rule plus; that is, we have provided an open rule which ensures that any amendments in order under the standing rules of the House may be offered. Additionally, we have provided protections for a variety of Members that require waivers.

There has been a great interest among Members in this bill. In fact, we had more than 40 amendments presented to the Committee on Rules yesterday and yesterday evening, and we spent the better part of yesterday evening, actually well into the night, attempting to craft this rule. In the end, the rule provides for waivers for 14 separate amendments above and beyond whatever amendments may be offered under the regular order of an open amendment process.

While we were unable to make provisions for each of the amendments submitted, we did seek to thread the needle and ensure adequate debate on the major issues raised by this bill.

□ 1100

In my view, this rule accomplishes that objective. I should note for those who like to keep score, that this type of "open rule plus" procedure is the same format that was used for last year's supplemental. Also, a bit of Committee on Rules history shows that 53 of the last 65 rules granted for supplementals have been open rules.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 450 is an open rule providing 1 hour general debate equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and waives

points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations of legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, except as specified in the rule.

This exception pertains to a provision in the bill under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, a legislative provision which did not have the concurrence of the authorizing committee.

The rule further provides, prior to the consideration of any other amendment, for consideration of the amendments printed in part A of the Committee on Rules report, which may be offered only in the order printed in the report.

The rule provides for the consideration of the amendments printed in part B of the Committee on Rules report, which may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill.

The rule provides that all of the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report and waives points of order during consideration of the bill against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI, prohibiting nonemergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have caused their amendments to be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule also allows for the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

And, lastly, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions as usual.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion voiced about this bill so far. Questions and concerns raised from many, many different perspectives. Some Members are uncomfortable with the defense funding, others have concerns about the counternarcotics package for Colombia. We have Members who believe this bill spends too much money, and we have other Members who seek more spending in other areas. We have Members who want to allocate more of the existing surplus to debt reduction, and we have Members who seek to realign priorities in the bill. With this rule, we have found a way to

accommodate a great many of those Members.

With respect to the defense spending in this bill, an amount that reflects a sizable increase over what was requested by the President, this is necessary because the administration has consistently underfunded and over-committed our Armed Forces to the point where readiness, training, equipment, and morale have all suffered, undeniably.

Whatever one's views about the wisdom of our policy in Kosovo, and I too have very deep misgivings about what we have been doing there and about what our definition of success is for that troubled region, though I have no misgivings about the brilliant performance of our military, the fact remains that President Clinton got us into that quagmire and now we have an obligation to foot the bill. We have to pay the President's bill.

We have been robbing Peter to pay Paul for too long when it comes to committing our military forces, causing in fact an emergency situation today. I fully support efforts in this bill to reverse that trend.

Turning to the other major component of the bill, the counternarcotics package centered on "Plan Colombia," I urge my colleagues to look beyond the price tag of today's proposal and consider the cost; the cost in lives, in dollars, and lost productivity; of ducking this fight at this time. I believe we must act now. The administration has already waited too long. The most recent statistics related to Colombia are alarming, and I want to highlight three areas.

First, the amount of drugs coming from Colombia is rising dramatically. Colombia now produces 60 percent of the world's cocaine crop, an astounding 90 percent of which makes its way here to the United States. Now, part of Colombia's problem is caused by our success in fighting the drug war in Peru and Bolivia. Much of the drug problem in terms of supply is now concentrated in Colombia, and that Democratically-elected government has asked for our assistance to deliver the coup de grace to the drug suppliers.

Second, the flow of drugs into the U.S. poses a direct threat to our children. One in every two American school kids will try illegal drugs before graduating high school unless we reverse the trends. We also know that the potency of Colombia's cocaine today and heroin today is rising, making it even more likely that today's curious kids, under peer pressure in school, seeking to try something cool or something new, could get hooked more easily and become tomorrow's addicts.

Illegal drug use costs U.S. society a staggering \$110 billion a year right now and results in more than 14,000 American deaths each year. I am going to

say that again: 14,000 American deaths each year; primarily our youth. That is unbelievable. I cannot seriously believe that any Member is going to pull out the flag of surrender and say we are quitting on the war on drugs with those kinds of statistics. This is a meaningful way to deal with that subject.

Third, illegal drug use costs the U.S. society, as I said, not only 14,000 American lives but billions of dollars. We are already in this thing; we need to finish it. Today, we find ourselves at a very critical point. In recent years, the United States has decreased the amount of money we spend on interdiction, lowering our guard and opening the door for well-financed, opportunistic, and ruthless narco-traffickers to boost their shipments and bring more drugs to our school yards and our playgrounds, and, indeed, those are their target areas.

Meanwhile, the political situation in Colombia has spiraled out of control, despite the sincere efforts of a friendly Democratically-elected government in that country that is trying to do the right thing and asking for help, not only from us but from other countries as well. So we find ourselves in a crisis we can no longer afford to ignore, and this is a true emergency.

We have heard arguments against the Colombia package based upon the fear that we will become sucked into another Vietnam and that we will be aiding and abetting human rights' abusers. I reject both of those arguments. We cannot simply put our head in the sand and pretend that the emergence of a narco-State in our own back yard would not adversely impact our national security.

Likewise, with regard to the question of human rights, later in today's debate I will be assisting in offering a bipartisan amendment designed to address those legitimate and important concerns head-on by conditioning military assistance on some tough certification requirements about ensuring that human rights' violators are properly dealt with.

And, lastly, we hear complaints that we are overly focused on the supply side of the equation. The fact is that in recent years we have cut back on interdiction and eradication in favor of more demand reduction and prevention programs here at home. And the statistics speak for themselves: That formula has failed. What we are trying to do in this bill is focus on the serious and growing threat that one of our close southern neighbors is being overrun by the drug traffickers who have sat their sights on unfettered access to the impressionable youth of America.

I believe we have provided for conditionality on the human rights' violations. I certainly want to underscore that it is the Colombians themselves who will be conducting this action. We

are providing some training, some logistic support and some equipment for them. We are not sending military troops in the sense that we sent them to Kosovo or other places recently we have read about. We are sending them to help train these people to take care of a problem within their borders.

And on the question of the balance between supply and demand and treatment, I believe that we have to fight the war on drugs on all fronts, not just one front. And I believe the statistics will show that we are doing well when we stay applied on all fronts.

So the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that when all is said and done today, the House will have worked its will on a large complicated spending package that contains many important provisions besides those I have addressed. I urge support for the rule so we can get on with this debate, which I suspect will go well into the evening.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of reasons to oppose this supplemental appropriations bill, one of the most important is the innocent people of Colombia. This bill will provide \$1.3 billion to a military with one of the worst human rights' records in that hemisphere, the Colombian military, over which neither the Colombian government nor the United States Armed Forces have much control.

Mr. Speaker, we have been here before. Maybe not all of my colleagues remember El Salvador, but I do. The Colombian military has strong ties to paramilitaries which commit unspeakable atrocities. The Salvadoran military had strong ties to death squads which used intimidation, torture, and murder to do the dirty work of the Salvadoran army.

They say this is very different. They say there is a president in Colombia who is determined to stand up to the military and the drug leaders. Maybe so, Mr. Speaker, but in El Salvador we had two presidents, both of them were educated at Jesuit universities, one at Georgetown and one at Notre Dame, and they were determined to do the same. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that in both El Salvador and Colombia the government has very little control over the military.

Both countries were embroiled in a brutal civil war. Colombia's Civil War has already cost 30,000 lives in the last 10 years. El Salvador's civil war killed 75,000 noncombatants over a period of 10 years. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker: The civil war in El Salvador, funded by the United States of America, killed 75,000 noncombatants.

Twenty years ago, Mr. Speaker, we were in the exact same situation that we are today. Twenty years ago we had a choice to make, Mr. Speaker, and we made the wrong choice. Today, the answer is clear. We must oppose this aid to a murderous Colombian military with a list of human rights' violations a mile long.

Now, just listen to a few of them. Just last January, Colombian paramilitaries, with ties to the Army, dragged 27 worshipers out of a church and shot them in cold blood. From January 7 to January 10 last year, paramilitaries committed 19 separate massacres, leaving 143 people dead and hundreds more displaced from their homes. And just last month, Mr. Speaker, paramilitaries linked to the Colombian army danced and drank as they tortured, as they beheaded, at least 28 villagers in northern Colombia.

Yet today, Mr. Speaker, the House is considering a \$1.3 billion military aid package for military aid, training, helicopters, and arms to that very same military. I am reminded of a letter that Salvadoran Archbishop Oscar Romero wrote to President Carter 20 years ago today begging him, in the interest of human rights, to stop the military aid to El Salvador. One month later, 20 years ago, Bishop Romero was murdered by a Salvadoran military death squad as he was saying mass.

Downstairs in my office hangs a picture of Archbishop Romero. Every day I look at it and every day I remember the grievous wrongs our country did helping to perpetuate those killings in his country. Mr. Speaker, let us not remember the 20th anniversary of Archbishop Romero by making the same mistakes in Colombia.

I have stood at the place where the Jesuits were killed, where their brains were splattered on a wall, blood all over the ground, and I just cannot stand by and watch our country do to Colombia what we did to El Salvador. The administration is wrong and my Republican colleagues are wrong. We are endangering thousands more lives in El Salvador, in Colombia. It should not be done. I would think the United States should have learned its lesson by now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the military aid to Colombia.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Speaker of the time on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 20 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 25 minutes remaining.

□ 1115

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say I am going to vote against this rule for a number of reasons. First of all, if we look at spending issues, we will see that the bill as reported is \$4 billion above the amount requested by the President. Before it is finished, this bill will have added to it an additional \$4 billion not requested by the President.

It is clear that only 1 week after this House passed a budget resolution promising to live within spending ceilings that the \$4 billion that will be added under the rule today is simply an attempt to get around those budget ceilings so that there will be \$4 billion more room in the defense appropriation for Members' projects. A very interesting exercise in fiscal discipline, it lasted one week.

Secondly, we are now being asked to enter into a huge new long-term commitment to underwrite a war in Colombia. We have been told it will last at least 5 years, and I suspect it will last probably 10.

For 35 years, the date of August 7, 1964, has lived in infamy in history because that was the day that Congress roared through the Gulf at Tonkin resolution on this very same floor with 40 minutes of debate.

Today, we are going to be given only 20 minutes to discuss the advisability of entering into this long 5- to 10-year commitment to underwrite this war in Colombia. That means that those of us who think this is not a good idea will have exactly 10 minutes to make our case. That is amazing.

Thirdly, despite the fact that the Rand Corporation has done a study financed in part by the U.S. Army which says that a dollar spent on reducing demand for drugs here at home is 23 times more effective than a dollar spent in reducing drug use through interdiction and supply reduction abroad, this rule denies us the opportunity to even vote on the Pelosi amendment, which would allow us to provide more funding to deal with the drug problem here at home by expanding drug treatment programs. That is, in my view, ill-advised.

There is also no provision allowed under which we could even put on the floor the President's request for debt relief for countries such as Bolivia and Honduras.

Lastly, I would say that there were over a dozen Democrats who asked to be allowed to offer amendments to this proposition. Only two were given the opportunity to offer those amendments. We have 10 amendments that are going to be offered by majority party Members and two others that are bipartisan, with lead sponsors being the majority party.

In other words, the majority party first crafted the initial bill to its liking. Now they insist on being able to

offer over 80 percent of the amendments that are going to be offered on the floor on this day. And then they wonder why there is not more support on this side of the aisle. I think those numbers speak for themselves.

This bill is a mistake. I will vote against the rule. I will vote against the bill. If we are going to get involved in a long-term war commitment in this hemisphere, we owe it to our constituents to spend more than 10 minutes discussing the consequences.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, unlike my friend and colleague, the previous speaker, I am going to support this rule. We need to get this rule passed. We need to get this supplemental on the floor, and we need to get it down to the other body so that then our friend and colleague, Senator STEVENS, can work his magic and get us a supplemental appropriations bill.

Now, time is not on our side in the case of the supplemental or our entire appropriations process. But let me just mention time in one regard. American soldiers are in Kosovo today. Americans are involved in a situation in Kosovo where we are putting up most of the assets. Many of our European allies are not responding to us with the support that they had promised to provide in Kosovo.

It is the humble opinion of this Member that the Kosovo experience is not going to be a positive one for the United States. And I hate to say that, because our troops do such a good job. But in order to eliminate the hatred and stop the killing that is taking place between not the organized groups in Kosovo but just the people themselves, neighbor to neighbor, the hate, the killing, we would have to put a soldier on every street corner in every city and town and hamlet in Kosovo. And, obviously, we cannot muster that kind of a major operation.

But the problem with Kosovo is that the money is already being spent. It is committed. The President deployed troops. The money is spent.

Now, where did the money come from? The money came from the fourth quarter operations and maintenance accounts of all of the military services. That means, if we do not replace this money, whether we like it or not, the fourth quarter training exercises of the United States military will have to stand down, many of them, because their fourth quarter money has already been spent.

Now, look at the calendar that I show here. All of this red is the fiscal year that has already gone by. This is today,

March 29. This part of the fiscal year is gone. If we look closely at the blue colors on this chart, those are colors that the Congress will be in recess for the political conventions this summer for the work periods back home in our districts at 4th of July and other times of the year. And so, the white numbers are the only really working days left to get this work done.

We have got to get this supplemental over to the Senate where Senator STEVENS, as I said, can work his magic. This will help us begin to replace this money for the military. Whether we like it or not, the President has already spent the money. When we pass this rule, we can deal with some of the other issues we will hear on the floor today.

We will deal with a number of the issues that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), raised. Some of them are very legitimate, and they should be considered and they should be debated. But we have got to move along. We need to adopt this rule this morning and get on to the consideration of this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The Chair will remind Members that although it is permissible to refer to the sponsor of a measure in the Senate, further personal references should be avoided.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a personal reference to a dear friend of mine and yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me the time. And he is my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that I disagree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY). It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the incredible work that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) did in Central America during the 1980s. More than any other individual in this institution, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) can take credit for saving thousands and thousands of lives, and I want to acknowledge that.

But I do disagree. Colombia is not Central America. Colombia is not El Salvador. There was recently an article in a report called the International Policy Report. The agency or the think tank that produces this particular publication is headed by the former ambassador to El Salvador, Robert White, who, by the way, was discharged from that ambassadorship because of his position on the issue of El Salvador by President Reagan.

Now, in fairness, I have to acknowledge that Ambassador White was clear that he disagreed with this particular package, but on other grounds. This article that was written by his associate

I think captures the fact that the analogy between Central America and Colombia is inaccurate. I am going to read some excerpts:

"Colombia's decades-old conflict and the effort to end it are far more complicated than the violence El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua suffered during the 1980s."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to point out: "Unlike the groups in El Salvador's FMLN and Guatemala's URNG, Colombia's three guerilla groups fight separately, violating human rights frequently, and are held in low esteem by most citizens. The paramilitary death squads operate in the open, resembling private armies more than shadowy groups of killers and are somewhat independent of the Army."

"Here in Colombia," he points out, "the Government seeks to bring guerillas to the negotiating table."

He concludes by saying, "With the exception of the United States, no foreign source arms or combatants. Instead, the drug trade pervades, corrupts, and finances all sides."

"On deeper examination, this conflict, the western hemisphere's oldest and most brutal, bears only a passing resemblance to Central America."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a gentleman who served with me in El Salvador.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the majority refused to allow debate on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) to add \$1.3 billion for drug treatment and prevention here at home.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, today we will be given very limited debate on a number of important amendments to the Colombia aid package. I strongly oppose this Colombia aid package as it is currently constituted.

Like every Member in this House, I want to support President Pastrana in his efforts to negotiate peace and end the 40-year civil war and to provide economic development for the Colombian people. And like every Member in this House, I want to reduce drug use in the United States. Unfortunately, this package will not further either of those goals.

The three antidrug battalions and related aircraft in this bill are to be de-

ployed in two southern provinces to root out guerillas that have been entrenched there for 40 years and to eradicate coca crops grown by peasant farmers. The futility of spending billions on eradication should be obvious to anyone who has studied this question, whether those studies are from the Rand Institute or our own GAO.

Coca is so profitable and easy to grow that short-term success has always proven an empty victory. Like mercury hit with a hammer, coca cultivation attacked in one location simply scatters elsewhere.

So what will this package achieve? In the most violent country in the hemisphere, it will only result in more violence. It will ally the United States with the most brutal military in the hemisphere.

Read the Human Rights Watch report. Read the reports of the Colombian Commission of Jurors. Read the reports by the United Nations and the OAS. They paint a picture of the Colombian military that I doubt any Member of this House would want to be associated with. And the victims, and there will be victims, will be the civilian population.

My colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), says that Colombia is not El Salvador. He is right in one respect. Colombia is 20 times the size of El Salvador.

I think one of the things that we need to do is we need to learn from the lessons of El Salvador and our other interventions in Central America to make sure we do not repeat the mistakes. Better to spend this money on treatment, education, and law enforcement here at home.

The best way to fight drugs is to reduce demand, something this bill does not even attempt to do. Defeat this rule and rethink the Colombia package.

□ 1130

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the distinguished subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time. The rule includes an amendment that will allow as we have heard for additional \$4 billion to be added to the defense accounts. It touches on many of the vital needs that we have in terms of our shortfall for our military. I will have an opportunity to discuss that later. I will not later be talking about the Colombia piece, and I would like to take just a moment to address that. I would like my colleagues to know that this brings back amazing memories. For the first time I ever focused upon my chairman the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) who today was pre-

senting the difficulty of our schedules and our ranking member the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), it was at a time that we were discussing Central America and Latin America.

In those days, the debate flowed around El Salvador and Nicaragua, Guatemala, indeed the voices that swirl around the ranking member today were very similar in those days. They were opposed to America's involvement in Central America. Today, we see that region thriving in democracy. Indeed today Colombia is asking us for our assistance with a very, very significant drug problem. Indeed, America cannot solve Colombia's entire problem; but they have asked for our help. It would be a grave error for us to make the same mistake that those same voices would have suggested we make in El Salvador in the country of Colombia. I urge us to pass the rule and indeed to support this bill in its final form.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would suggest the gentleman go back and recheck my record. I did not oppose our efforts in Salvador. I opposed certain efforts that did not provide for the support of legitimate democratic forces, but I also supported funding for Salvador.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Taking back my time, there is little doubt that the voices were almost identical to those that flow today regarding this issue. There is little question, they did not want us involved in El Salvador or Nicaragua, and there is democracy there today because of America's involvement in part. Colombia has a major problem. They are asking for our assistance. I would suggest that we provide them with a small amount of assistance.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Institutional memory, Mr. Speaker, is the ability to recognize a mistake and make it again. Let us hope we do not do it again today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday morning, the House passed the Republican budget resolution by all of four votes. Today, the Republican leadership would override it because if this rule passes, the House will take up and probably pass a supplemental appropriations bill that, with amendments, will put spending \$4 billion above the level assumed in the budget resolution we passed just days ago. And since the extra costs will not be offset, the budget surplus for 2000 will drop and so will the budget surplus for 2001. Indeed, by our calculation, this supplemental, together with other activities, actions already or likely to be passed will reduce the surplus, the on-budget surplus for

this year from \$26.5 billion to \$5.1 billion.

Last week when the House debated the budget resolution, we predicted that over 10 years the Republican resolution which passed would spend all of the non-Social Security surplus and \$68 billion of the Social Security surplus. We pointed out that the resolution assumed discretionary spending cuts of \$117 billion over 5 years which we seriously doubted Congress would ever make; and if those cuts were not made, we predicted that you would have to dig even deeper into Social Security. We were convinced that eventually this resolution would be overridden as it was in 1999 and again in 1998, but we never thought you would do it in less than a week.

Now, I readily agree that this bill contains funds for national defense and domestic priorities that are important. I am not contesting the validity of most of these items. I am making a stronger point. I think this supplemental shows that the budget resolution adopted just days ago contains spending levels for discretionary spending that are a sham.

Last week you were calling for Draconian spending cuts. This week you are calling for dramatic increases, \$12.5 billion this year. Granted this spending is for this year alone but it is bound to have recurring effects. I cannot believe that what we are doing for Colombia will end this year. I cannot believe that the spare parts we are buying now for 2001 will not be needed next year. We need a realistic budget resolution. I think we should hold in abeyance this supplemental until we come back from conference with a budget resolution that is realistic and it recognizes the costs that we are surely going to incur as this supplemental points out.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I rise in strong opposition to this rule. The emergency spending bill appropriates \$9 billion. However, this rule does not make in order the Wukiykendall-Capps amendment to provide just \$14.2 million to help hard-pressed West Coast fishermen.

Pacific Coast fishermen have had their livelihood restricted by the Federal Government's effort to restore the West Coast groundfish fishery. This is costing hardworking men and women millions of dollars in lost income. It is hurting communities up and down the coast like Morro Bay and Avila Beach in my district.

The governors of California, Oregon, and Washington have requested disaster assistance for fishing communities. The administration recognized their need and asked for this funding. The money would fund important research and stock assessment of the

fishery, it would allow for the buyback of permits and boats, and it would help communities cope with the loss of a big industry.

The fishing men and women in my district would rather be on the water hauling in their catch. But if we are going to keep them off their boats, it is imperative that we help them to feed their families. I am disappointed in this rule. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Let me give a response to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) with respect to the dollars that are in this supplemental under the defense heading.

They are there simply because your Marines, your Air Force, your Army, your Navy needs them. Every time the Commandant of the Marine Corps addresses Congress in any forum, he always says, "This is your Marine Corps." And in a very true sense, it is your Marine Corps and all the rest of the services. As my friend the gentleman from South Carolina knows, and I know that is the reason the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is going to join with me and a number of other people in supporting the Lewis-Spence amendment to bring in about 4 billion extra dollars in spare parts, in safety fixes, in emergency fixes on the military health care system and a number of other areas where there truly is an emergency.

That is why Democrats and Republicans have very carefully asked the services when they came before us, did the \$305 billion defense budget submitted by the administration, does that take care of what your troops need, and they told us no. We said, be specific. And they outlined \$15 billion worth of unfunded requirements; things we had to do.

Let me tell my colleagues why they outlined them to us. They outlined them to us because our planes in many cases are not able to get off the ground and go do the mission. The mission capability is dropping like a rock. That means your plane cannot start up on the tarmac or on a carrier deck, go off, do its mission, and return.

They brought them to us because, in my estimation, the safety record is going down in the services. Eighty crashes of military aircraft in 1998 and 1999, 80 crashes, 90 dead as a result of those crashes. We have got old platforms. We have got platforms without spare parts.

The Air Force is 1,200 pilots short. Some of the money in this amendment, the Spence-Lewis amendment, requests extra money for recruiting, for retention, to keep skilled people in the services. This is probably our most important job, keeping our Nation secure.

This amendment gives about 25 percent of what our services told us they have to have to keep the wheels turning, to keep this reduced force going, to keep the equipment repaired, to keep the spares coming.

When we went to Kosovo, Air Force readiness went down 50 percent State-side because we had to move all the spare parts and all the available mechanics because we did not have very many of them, we had to move them into theater. So we dropped mission capability 50 percent in the units that were remaining. We are stretched very thin. Please work with us. Moderates, liberals, conservatives, vote for the Spence-Lewis amendment. It helps America's people in uniform.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, a rule that will not allow Democrats by and large to offer amendments on this most important supplemental appropriation, the first one, I might add, for the 21st century. Eighty percent of the amendments are by the majority party. We were not able to offer many.

One of the most important amendments is an amendment that would provide treatment on demand for those Americans who found themselves unfortunately addicted to drugs, drugs I might add that more than any other country in the world Colombia supplies the heroin and the cocaine that has infested our families and our neighborhoods across America.

In this supplemental, we are providing \$1.7 billion to Colombia and not a penny for drug treatment. I think it is horrible that the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) was not allowed, and I think we should vote against this rule.

Additionally, Mozambique. We are told that the assessment must be made for Mozambique. The assessment I understand will be done on Friday. I offered an amendment in committee, \$60 million, \$20 million for child survival, \$20 million for development assistance, \$20 million for international disaster relief, but withdrew the amendment because they said we had to have the assessment.

The chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), have agreed that this money should come forth and the money is in the accounts now to be released for Mozambique. Release the money. It ought to be a part of the rule. We ought to be able to debate it. We are not able at this time.

Treat those Americans who are addicted to much of the drugs that come from Colombia. We are not allowed to debate; we are not allowed to offer it. It is a bad rule. Vote against it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in this supplemental, there is \$40 million to deal with the citrus canker problem in Florida, a problem that the Department of Agriculture said could have been handled probably with \$5 million had they jumped on it immediately.

The Department of Agriculture now is saying if we do not jump on the plum pox virus problem again, we are not going to have a \$5 million problem, we are going to have a several billion dollar problem. This citrus problem is probably going to cost at least \$200 million.

What has happened in Europe and what has happened in Spain and Chile is that their stone fruit crop was wiped out. If you happen to produce peaches, apricots, plums, cherries, almonds, avocados in your particular districts, they will be wiped out.

I have four orchards in my district now. They had to destroy the entire orchard. You cannot destroy the infected tree. You have to destroy the entire orchard. They waited 10 years to get profit, all of a sudden they must burn that crop and must wait 2 years then to replant the trees and then wait another 5 years to get any profit from that production. The Department of Agriculture says it spends \$6 million now to stop it in its tracks or let it spread through Washington, California, Michigan, Maryland, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Georgia and wherever else they grow peaches, prunes, apricots, avocados, et cetera.

And they have asked for the money, because they realize that it is their watch and if they do not stop it now, it becomes a billion-dollar problem. Unfortunately, OMB has not released the money as they have not released the \$40 million for the citrus problem in Florida.

□ 1145

So I hope that everybody understands, we will pay \$6 million this year, or we will pay billions and billions of dollars in the future when many of my colleagues will still be in the Congress of the United States. So I would hope my colleagues would come back with an appropriation to allow them to wipe out this virus immediately, rather than see it spread all over the United States.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the rule today. We appeared before the Committee on Rules late last night with a bipartisan, commonsense approach to a real emergency, a real disaster: emergency aid to West Coast fishers and owners of small fishing boats. This real emer-

gency is caused by a fish population decline and by bad Federal policy. It affects the entire West Coast.

Simply put, there are too many fishing boats, too few fish, and too many Federal fishing restrictions based on spotty data.

The bipartisan commonsense amendment we offered, offered by me, by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPs), and by the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL), that is two Democrats and two Republicans, would have addressed these challenges with better science and better fish counting, with a buy-back of boats to reduce fishing capacity, and financial aid to affected families.

Mr. Speaker, this commonsense, bipartisan amendment was rejected by the Committee on Rules in the dead of night. I guess it is easy for common sense and compassion to die late at night.

I ask my colleagues who care about hard-working fishing families to vote against this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 9 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts would like to continue the rotation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his realization that my 9 minutes is more important than his 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in utter consternation that the Republican majority has not allowed Democrats to offer worthy amendments under this so-called open rule.

First of all, allowing only 10 minutes to debate war in Colombia and a major U.S. commitment that will be long term is absolutely reprehensible.

Secondly, on the domestic scene, when we look at oil prices and our total dependence on foreign sources of supply into this economy, and the fact that we have not been allowed to offer amendments that would ask our Secretary of Energy to begin to move toward renewables here at home, giving him the right to purchase ethanol and bio diesel, to fill that strategic petroleum reserve, which, by the way, 90 percent of it has been imported foreign oil.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield to the gentleman; I do not have enough time right now. The gentleman did not give me the right to offer these amendments.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would offer the gentleman time right now if she would like to yield to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does control the time. The gentleman may proceed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, that is the gentleman that denied me the right to offer my amendments on this floor.

Now, I want to say on this oil business that for us to continue foreign dependence is absolutely a military vulnerability to the United States of America. We had an amendment that would have allowed the Secretary of Energy to purchase domestically produced product and put it in the reserve and we have been denied that opportunity here on the floor.

Finally, in the area of farm crisis here at home, low prices across this country, our farmers biting the dust, small and medium-sized farmers; we had an amendment in here that would have permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to offer equity capital in loans to those small and medium-sized farmers trying to reposition in this cruel marketplace today. We were disallowed the ability to do that. This is the year of 2000. They cannot hang on until next year.

I want to say that many of our Members here also went up to the Committee on Rules yesterday. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who was just here on the floor asking for plum pox which is going to destroy the fruit crop in Pennsylvania and it will spread to other States. The gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) for special crop disasters in New York and California and other places; the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DELAURO) on lobster fisheries; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), and the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) on the spread of bovine tuberculosis in the State of Michigan; and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) who just appeared on fisheries on the West Coast.

Vote "no" on the rule. Too many of our Members have been excluded.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I would like to, if I could, have the attention of my very good friend from Toledo to explain and clarify.

I understand that she is very concerned about this rule, but I would like to explain it. This is an open rule. We have an open amendment process, which allows any germane amendment to be considered and fully debated, without any time limitation whatsoever. So if my friend would choose to

offer a striking amendment, if my friend would choose to offer anything that falls within the rubric of germaneness, she clearly has a right to do that.

Now, she talked about 10 minutes that is allowed for her amendment. The ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), has the full general debate time, a half an hour, during which that entire time can be expended talking about this issue, if he so wishes.

So I think it is important to note that we have time limits imposed on those which we granted waivers to which are beyond the standard Rules of the House; and what we have done is we have allowed full, no time limits whatsoever on any germane amendment.

That is why I want to urge my colleagues, since this is an open amendment process, and yes, we have provided waivers for 14 additional amendments which have been made in order so that we can have a full debate on a lot of different issues; but the fact of the matter is, for people to come down here and vote against an open rule, I am really concerned about the prospect of that.

So I urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I believe that it is the right thing, and we will have a very full day.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on a daily basis I hear my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, lament the fact that Americans are deployed all around the world, usually without congressional approval.

I asked the Committee on Rules to approve an amendment that would have limited American troop strength in Colombia to 300 personnel. I did that because Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution says that Congress has the power to declare war and only the Senate can involve this country in mutual defense treaties. I did that so that the \$1.8 billion that is going to Colombia would not bring American troops with it.

Mr. Speaker, as we are getting ready to spend our money there, the Colombians have just changed their law so that if one has a high school diploma, one does not get drafted. They have just cut their spending for defense. My hunch is the Colombians think we are going to fight their war for them.

If it is the will of Congress to do so, then I think Congress ought to vote on this. However, far too often, both Republican and Democratic Congresses, by omission and commission, have not done their job and decided where and when young Americans will be called on to fight.

I am going to oppose this rule because, once again, the Committee on Rules has seen to it that we will not make that decision.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his great leadership on human rights throughout this hemisphere and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to listen to the chairman of the Committee on Rules claim that this is an open rule. Perhaps the word "open" to him means open only to Republicans; Democrats need not apply with amendments.

This bill has been called an emergency because we have an emergency in the drug abuse situation in our country. Indeed, we do. Mr. Speaker, 5.5 million people in America are in need of substance abuse treatment, but this rule is closed to any consideration of those people. It allows 10 minutes for an amendment to consider military assistance to Colombia in order to eradicate the coca leaf which flies in the face of all of the research on how we reduce demand in the U.S.

But do not take my word for it.

As the distinguished ranking member referred to earlier, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the Rand report, which was put together, the research was sponsored by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, by the U.S. Army, and the Rand's Drug Policy Research Center, this report says that for every dollar spent on treatment on demand is 23 times more effective than coca leaf eradication in the source country. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that if one wants to reduce substance abuse in this country 1 percent, one would spend \$34 million, \$34 million on treatment on demand; and that 1 percent reduction in the source country would be \$723 million for the same result.

Yes, we have an emergency in our country. Mr. Speaker, 5.5 million, as I said, Americans are in need of substance abuse treatment. Two million of them are receiving it, and 3.5 million people are in need.

My amendment for \$600 million would have addressed the need of 5 percent of those people, 5 percent; and yet this rule closed us down to have these Members on both sides of the aisle recognize the need in our own country for treatment on demand and for prevention. It is a dollar better spent. Everyone agrees to that. It has a result that is documented, and yet we could not even have an amendment.

How can we have a drug bill on this floor that talks about the emergency of substance abuse in our country that does not allow \$1 to be spent on prevention and treatment on demand? It simply does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the bill also because of not allowing a fuller debate on the subject of our military assistance to Colombia. Perhaps we should go that route. We do not know, my Repub-

lican colleagues do not know, because we have not discussed it.

I urge my colleagues, with no reluctance at all, to vote resoundingly against this closed rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to all Members, as they all know, that an open rule is an open rule under the Rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency supplemental. Let me cite some emergencies for our colleagues: Hurricane Floyd, Hurricane Andrew, Hurricane Hugo, the wildlands fires in California and in the west States of Oregon and Washington, the Midwestern States. How about the World Trade Center bombing. How about the Murrah Building bombing in Oklahoma City. How about the earthquakes at Loma Prieta and North Ridge. Or how about the recent fire that killed 5 firefighters in Worcester, Massachusetts, or just last night in Fort Worth, Texas where a tornado in downtown Fort Worth killed 4 people.

What is common with all of these emergencies, Mr. Speaker? They were all handled by our domestic defenders, our 1.2 million fire and EMS people who have not received one dime of support from this body in the past.

Today, an amendment will be offered that will, for the first time, provide \$100 million for the fire and EMS personnel across America, 85 percent of whom are volunteers, 32,000 departments, on average, 60 to 80 in every congressional district represented in this body. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot pass that Weldon-Hoyer bipartisan amendment supported by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL); supported by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS); supported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) unless we pass the rule.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, we cannot pass the amendment unless colleagues on both sides of the aisle join in supporting the bipartisan Weldon-Hoyer-Smith-Pascrell-Andrews amendment for the fire service.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot provide the \$100 million of short-term funding and access to \$4.8 billion of long-term funding unless we pass the supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues who have joined in support of the Pascrell bill, over 260 of us, to support the fire service of this country. Today is our chance. Fire fighters across America are going to man the phones. Now is Members' chance to show their support for them with a real vote to help deal with the emergencies of this country.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have a very critical problem in America today. It is called, training our military on the East Coast. The only place we can really put this thing together happens to be a little island outside of Puerto Rico called Vieques.

There is the final test for the Navy and Marines. That is where they go and do the live fire. That is where they go out prepared to take on any commitment that the United States has.

Now we find ourselves in a position, Mr. Speaker, where trespassers have come in, occupied the ground, gone through the gates, squatted on the ground, and we cannot do it any longer. It just totally amazes me. Our officers have gone to the Attorney General and said, kick these people off. Our Attorney General will not do it.

So we find ourselves in the position, Mr. Speaker, of, what do we do at this point? How important is this training? Let me tell the Members what the Secretary of the Navy says: "This training wins wars. Many Americans in uniform owe their lives to this crucial training. Many would perish without it."

The chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have both testified that the combined live fire training at Vieques is the most effective training we can do.

We have an amendment, the Fowler-Hansen amendment, that will be coming up. It does this. I hope people pay attention. One, there can be no trespassers on this live fire area. Like most people in the United States, we all have in every State live fire going on and we do not have trespassers.

It restores the integrity of the range. It tells the Attorney General to get these people off, and live fire would resume before the \$40 million goes to them.

I would hope people would support this commonsense amendment.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if Members want to know why the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is unhappy, just recognize this: The majority runs this institution. The majority wrote this bill. They used the Budget Act then to fence out amendments.

Out of the 14 amendments being allowed under this bill, two are being offered by Democrats, ten by Republicans, and two have a bipartisan tone. That in my view is not a balanced approach.

I would also urge Members to recognize that we should not spend a lousy 10 minutes debating whether we are going to be at war in Colombia for the next 5 years. I would remind Members of what James Hoagland, the distinguished columnist, asked; that now, in the rush into this quagmire, what is happening:

"What happens when it becomes clear that the considered judgment of U.S. Air Force officers that the Colombia military will not be able to maintain the Black Hawks under the condition in which they will be flying is shown to be correct? Will the United States replace the helicopters that crash or are shot down, at \$13 million a copy? Will large numbers of U.S. advisers be provided to maintain the helicopter force?"

"Clinton, of course, will not be around to provide answers. The helicopters will not arrive until 6 months after he leaves office. His successor will inherit an open-ended military obligation that can be trimmed back or abandoned only at domestic political cost."

It says, ". . . House Republicans have championed supersized aid to Colombia, with an eye to blasting Clinton and GORE if it is not passed. They are the true catalysts for this foreign policy fiasco. They blithely ignore the fact that American demand is at the root of the drug problem more than Columbian supply. They voted down efforts by Representative NANCY PELOSI to add funds for drug treatment at home in the catch-all bill that provides aid to Colombia. They sliced out of that same bill \$211 million in debt relief for the world's poorest countries. They will shoot away the problems of the Third World."

"That has been tried elsewhere, with similar fuzzy and contradictory thinking in Washington at the take-off. I can only wonder: Where is the Vietnam Syndrome when we need it?"

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad today this rule will allow us to debate this Vieques range. The range is the only place on the East Coast where we can do live fire training of all the combined forces. That means Marines ashore, Navy in ships, airmen in aircraft, whether we are shooting or missiles or live fire artillery, and we are doing it in conjunction with our forces. That is training that is invaluable when we have to go fight a war.

For the last decade, nearly every deployment this Nation has had from the East Coast of the United States has sent American military forces directly into combat operations. Whether it is the Persian Gulf War or Kosovo, other Balkan operations, or operations like Operation Desert Fox, where we went immediately into bombing in Iraq as part of the no-fly zone enforcement, or getting inspectors back into the country, live information training is essential.

I as a young artilleryman in the Marine Corps trained at a live fire range in Oklahoma. I was only 3 miles away

from U.S. citizens in my training. Here we have at least an 8-mile piece of safe zone. This amendment needs to be approved. Vote for the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the previous question and the rule. Our military has been underfunded. We cannot protect America with a neighborhood crime watch. Congress should be bolstering up our defenses.

I will also notify the Congress I will be offering a buy American amendment to this that will say, when you are spending this money, try and buy American-made products, try and buy American services to keep the ball rolling.

I think it is a good rule and it is a good bill. We should support both.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my dear friend, my colleague, the gentleman from California, said we should fund the Colombia military because there is peace in El Salvador today. I would remind my colleague that peace in El Salvador did not start until we cut off the military aid to El Salvador. After 12 years of brutal war and 75,000 innocent lives lost, the parties did not come anywhere near the negotiating table until we cut the military aid to El Salvador. As long as we were funding the war, it continued. As long as we fund the Colombian military and as long as we provide them weapons, they will use those weapons and the war will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope the rule does not pass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to quickly point to a few things.

First of all, I am not sure that everybody really understands that the FARC is not just another political opposition group. This is a vicious guerilla band of people that this past weekend killed 26 policemen in Colombia, in one city, in Bahia del Puerto. They beheaded the chief of police and killed four children between the ages of 3 and 7, to say nothing of their mothers and other innocent victims.

This is, unfortunately, routine business. This is the face of a terrorist insurrection against a democratic government.

Secondly, I would like to point out, the much-discussed Rand report talking about how much more we get out of our money for treatment, that is interesting if we are talking about treatment, but we are talking about trying to stop people from becoming victims. We do not want them to become addicts. We do want to treat the addicts,

but we want to stop our youth from becoming addicts by making sure there is no supply for them. That is a legitimate part of what we are about.

The third thing is, there are many elements to this bill that were not discussed today: Kosovo burdensharing, a critical bipartisan amendment that I know will get a lot of attention as the day goes on.

The fourth thing, some talk about entanglement. We are not sending an expeditionary force, we are sending training and logistics support.

Fifth, what does this matter to the average American who does not necessarily know where Colombia falls on the map of the world? I will tell Members what it matters, it matters about our kids, our kids who are tempted by the scourge of drugs. We are dealing with our children and our grandchildren and their future.

If Members do not like that, we are dealing with the price of gas, because gas comes from this area, too. Destabilization in this area is just going to keep the price of gas higher longer.

So there are lots of ways Members can bring this personally to themselves and into their lives, to their pocketbook, to their quality of life. But nothing, nothing should take second place to the well-being of our kids and us doing our job to make sure they are properly protected.

This is a good open rule, it is a fair rule. I urge support for the rule.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, early last Friday, the House passed the Republican budget resolution for Fiscal Year 2001 by all of 4 votes. Today, the Republican leadership overrides it. If this rule passes, the House will take up a supplemental appropriations bill that, with likely amendments, is \$4 billion above the spending level assumed in the budget resolution the House just passed. Since the extra cost will not be offset, the budget surplus for 200 will drop and so will the surplus for 2001. In fact, by our calculation, this supplemental, along with other actions already taken or likely to be taken, will reduce the on-budget surplus this year from \$26.5 billion to \$4.9 billion.

Last week, when the House debated the budget resolution, we predicted that over ten years, the Republican budget would spend all of the non-Social Security surplus and \$68 billion of the Social Security surplus. We pointed out how the Republican resolution assumed spending cuts of \$117 billion over five years, cuts we doubted Congress would make. And if those unrealistic cuts weren't made, we warned that you would dig even more into the Social Security surplus. We were convinced that this resolution would be overridden by more spending, as were the budget resolutions in 1999 and 1998, but we never thought you would do it in less than a week.

I readily agree that this bill contains funds for national defense and domestic priorities that are important. I am not contesting the validity of most of these items. I am contesting the validity of your budget resolution, for this supplemental shows that your spending levels are a sham.

A few days ago, you were calling for draconian spending cuts. Now you are asking for dramatic increases, \$12.5 billion in one year, much more than the President requested.

The President requested \$2.2 billion for non-defense programs for the supplemental. The bill reported out of committee takes that request up to \$3.2 billion, an increase of almost 50 percent. About \$600 million of this \$1.0 billion uses fiscal year 2000 funding to buy fiscal year 2001 items: \$282 million for domestic electronic surveillance of drug activities, and \$318 million for anti-drug efforts in Columbia.

For defense, the President requested a supplemental of \$2.3 billion. The bill the committee reported more than doubles that to \$5.2 billion. The Spence-Lewis amendment would add \$4.0 billion to that. Much of this would use fiscal year 2000 money to buy fiscal year 2001 items, easing the strain on 2001. But many of the defense adds are recurring costs, such as defense health care funding and spare parts and maintenance for weapon systems like Apache helicopters and Navy ships. By making this add, Republicans are disavowing the spending level for defense specified in last week's budget resolution, and not just for 2001. In all probability, Congress will have to continue appropriating these additional sums in future years.

Does anyone here honestly believe that this is a one-time request for Colombia?

This supplemental is a clever way to turn the flank of the resolution passed last week. It's a scheme that allows Congress to pay some fiscal year 2001 costs using fiscal year 2000 money. I understand the need. But if Republicans find the 2001 spending levels too tight, how will you find the spending levels in 2002, when the discretionary spending cuts get deeper? And at the same time the spending cuts get deeper, the tax cuts get larger. What does this portend for Social Security? Will you be forced to tap even more into the Social Security surplus?

This supplemental shows that the Republican budget is not serious. Until Congress has passed a conference report with realistic spending levels and responsible tax cuts, we should hold this supplemental in abeyance.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, which specifically makes in order twelve amendments offered by Republicans and waives all points of order against these amendments. Only two amendments offered by Democrats were made in order by this partisan rule.

I plan to offer an amendment to restore a mere \$210 million in funding, which was requested by the President to provide debt relief to Mozambique and other heavily indebted poor countries. This Republican rule does not allow my amendment.

Mozambique—one of the world's poorest countries—has recently experienced its worst flooding in 50 years. There are now hundreds of thousands of displaced people who are in desperate need of food, clean water, medicine, blankets and tents. The government of Mozambique cannot possibly address the needs of these displaced people or repair its damaged infrastructure while continuing to make debt payments to foreign governments. Debt relief has never been more important for Mozambique than it is now.

Debt relief for the world's poorest countries is supported by a worldwide movement of churches, religious groups and non-governmental organizations. This movement, known as Jubilee 2000, was begun by Christians who believe that the year 2000, the two thousandth anniversary of the coming of Christ, is a Jubilee Year. According to the Bible, the Lord instructed the people of Ancient Israel to celebrate a Jubilee—or a Year of the Lord—every 50 years. During a Jubilee Year, debts were forgiven. Debt forgiveness for poor countries is the moral thing to do.

This partisan rule also did not allow consideration of the Pelosi amendment, which would have added funding for drug treatment and prevention programs. This bill contains \$1.7 billion for international counter-narcotics programs. We need to focus on demand reduction here in the United States, which fuels the production of drugs abroad.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this unfair and shortsighted rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—241

Aderholt	Castle	Gallegly
Andrews	Chabot	Ganske
Archer	Chambliss	Gekas
Armey	Chenoweth-Hage	Gibbons
Bachus	Coble	Gilchrest
Baker	Coburn	Gillmor
Baldacci	Collins	Gilman
Ballenger	Combust	Goode
Barr	Cook	Goodlatte
Barrett (NE)	Cooksey	Goodling
Bartlett	Cox	Goss
Bass	Cubin	Graham
Bateman	Cunningham	Green (WI)
Bereuter	Davis (VA)	Greenwood
Biggert	Deal	Gutknecht
Bilbray	Delahunt	Hall (TX)
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Hansen
Bishop	DeLay	Hastert
Bliley	DeMint	Hastings (WA)
Blunt	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Boehlert	Dickey	Hayworth
Boehner	Dicks	Hefley
Bonilla	Doolittle	Heger
Bono	Dreier	Hill (MT)
Boyd	Duncan	Hilleary
Brady (PA)	Dunn	Hobson
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Hoeffel
Bryant	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Burr	Emerson	Horn
Burton	English	Hostettler
Buyer	Ewing	Houghton
Callahan	Farr	Hulshof
Calvert	Fletcher	Hunter
Camp	Foley	Hutchinson
Campbell	Fossella	Hyde
Canady	Fowler	Isakson
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Istook

Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt

Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland

Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento

Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—12

Barton
Boucher
Conyers
Crane
Everett
Franks (NJ)
Granger
Klink
Kucinich
McIntosh
Quinn
Salmon

□ 1231

Ms. SANCHEZ and Ms. CARSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. REYES and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 450, the resolution just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 450 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3908.

□ 1232

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the House today the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill.

The Committee on Appropriations ordered this legislation reported by a nearly three to one bipartisan vote. It is reflective of a compilation of input from many sources on a large spectrum of issues. The request was thoroughly reviewed, hearings were held, input from Members outside the committee was received, and our committee painstakingly marked up the bill. The result of all of this is the bill before us.

The bill includes \$1.7 billion for counternarcotics activities in the Colombian and Andean region. By and large, the bill provides what the President requested for Colombia. In addition, the bill takes a more regional approach by providing increased help to the anti-drug efforts of Colombia's neighbors. Before any of the funds going to South America can be spent, the Secretary of State is to report on how the money will be used. The bill also funds high priority anti-drug activities in the Departments of Justice and Defense.

Also included in this bill is nearly \$5 billion for national security matters. The President's emergency request for \$2 billion for operations in Kosovo and East Timor is met. I must remind our colleagues that this money replenishes funds that have already been spent for both of these operations. In fact, the money has been spent and borrowed from the fourth quarter operations and maintenance accounts of all of the military services. So that money has to be repaid, or the training activities in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year for our Nation's military will have to stand down dramatically.

This bill also includes \$1.6 billion to help cover increasing fuel costs facing the Defense Department. As we drive up to the gas tanks and fill up our cars, we see a tremendous increase in the cost of fuel. The ships that we drive, the airplanes that we fly, the trucks and the tanks that we drive, all of these things that use fuel are experiencing the same thing. So we do provide the money to make up for the increased fuel costs.

The bill also includes \$854.5 million to the financially troubled Defense Health Program, a health program that promises medical care for members of the military, their families, and those retirees who are eligible for military medical care. There are doctors, there are nurses, there are pharmacies, and there are medical people who provide medical care who have provided their services but have not been paid. We are in arrears to at least that amount of money. So we include it in this bill. The President did not request these two items; but they are urgently needed, and we will have to provide the money sooner or later.

In the natural disaster and other emergencies areas, the bill includes

NAYS—182

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge

Evans
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)

Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer